

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 5, 1998

LB 989

original bill, we're going to lock all those funds down; we're going to put an absolute lid on all of them. The Revenue Committee realizes that there are some good beneficial uses for some of those things, one-time projects, and that you probably don't want to funnel them all in and make them have to make up some General Funds, particularly if you're going to be under a lid limitation. So what the Revenue Committee did was a very good thing, to a certain extent, is they tried to do a little of both and they tried to...to do that so they made the distinction between new, new kenos, for the fear that people would start up those new keno operations and perhaps try to get around the lid. That's to their benefit, but it violates and it sets up a two-tier system here that I don't think is...is good, and you shouldn't use those or be forced to use those in General Fund operations. I would hope that with this amendment we strike out those provisions for the new lottery; we take the keno funds out of the restricted fund definition. That's what the amendment does. It would restore and maintain our historic position to use those for one-time operations or one-time funds, special projects, community betterment, and we wouldn't force communities to be in the box where they may have to use those where, if they have increases, you'd have to require some decreases in tax, or the other would happen as well. But some of those would have to be...

SENATOR VRTISKA: One minute.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: ...treated as tax revenue. So I think that the discussion has been good. It's a philosophic discussion. The philosophic issue is do you want to maintain our...our fundamental public policy that we're going to use keno funds for community betterment, one-time funds and special projects, or you going to require them, through the use of this, for some of those proceeds to have to be channeled in to the general operations of government, which is not a good public policy which will, down the line for some communities, create a real burden? Because you'll have one group of communities out there who will be using keno for betterment and special funds and then you're going to have these other ones who are going to have them as restricted funds. It's not a good public policy to have those two different treatments at the same time. I hope that you adopt the amendment. In the words of Senator Coordsen,